

TASL Workshop I, January 21, 2005

Workshop Assessment Analysis

Assessment began prior to the first workshop in order to ascertain information that would aid in the planning of the agenda. The findings indicated that half of the respondents did not currently have a QEP for their campus, and half did. The results were the same regarding a QEP for a specific program. Respondents rated their current knowledge regarding SACS initiatives and QEPs as basic or low. Three of the respondents rated their knowledge as moderate to high. With the exception of two respondents, all indicated no knowledge of what other colleges are doing with regard to QEP planning.

Based on this pre-workshop questionnaire, plans were made for a basic presentation on the principles of assessment with examples of college initiatives across the U.S. Opportunities for participants to interact and network were scheduled, a major presenter was chosen to discuss specific SACS compliance issues and the basics of a QEP, and work groups were formed to address specific areas of interest.

There were two parts to the post-workshop assessment. One part included narrative descriptions regarding the major characteristics of the workshop. Each characteristic narrative described a level of quality such as "There was much evidence of...", "There was adequate evidence of...", "There was some evidence with suggestions for improvement" and "There was little evidence...". Numerical scores for each narrative were assigned after completion of this portion of the assessment. Since there were no indications of "little evidence" for each category, that narrative was given a score of 0. The remaining scores, from highest to lowest was 3 (much evidence), 2 (adequate evidence), 1 (some evidence with suggestions for improvement). With a total of 15 completed assessment packages, the score range was 30-45. (There was only one score of "1" for one characteristic, with no suggestions for improvement offered.) A numerical average of each characteristic was calculated and is illustrated in the following table.

Numerical averages for assessment of workshop Characteristics*

Workshop Characteristics	Numerical Average of Scores
Evidence of planning	38
Evidence of research	40
Materials	42
Interaction	41
Environment	38
Expectations	35

**Scores were assigned according to narrative descriptions of characteristics*

If the evaluative terms of excellent , good, and average were assigned to the scores of 3,2and 1, respectively; the overall assessment of these workshop characteristic indicate that the participants perceived the workshop to be good to excellent. (The numerical total for the rank of excellent =45: good=30.)

The second part of the assessment gave participants the opportunity to assess the workshop using likert scales and declarative answers such as yes, no, some, very much.

The first two likert scales were provided for the rating of the overall value (1poor to 5=excellent) of the workshop and the suitability (1=not suitable; 5= suitable) of the format of the workshop. Results are presented in the following table.

Results of Likert Scale Assessments

Overall value	1 = 0	2 = 0	3 = 1	4 = 8	5 = 6
Format	1= 0	2 = 1	3 = 0	4 = 8	5 = 6

Ratings of the overall value and the suitability of the workshop were good to excellent

The second portion of this part of the assessment provided participants to respond to tow questions regarding use of information from the workshop and recommendation of the workshop to a colleague. All participants indicated that they would use the information from the workshop on their own campuses. Eight percent (12 of 15) participants indicated that they would recommend the workshop to a colleague. There were 0 "no" rankings

for this question. One participant indicated "possibly" and 2 participants indicated "depends" with no comments or feedback regarding their answers except the following: "I think my administrators would be better suited in attending - I learned a lot of information that I probably would have never learned."

The presenters were all very "informative". Dr. Pate received "good" to "excellent" ratings; Dr. Phillips received all "excellent" ratings, and Dr. Hence received more "good" than "excellent" ones. Dr. Pate's presentation was meant to increase basic understandings of the principles of assessment and to inform the participants of what other campuses were doing. Dr. Phillips' presentation was meant to be the focus of the workshop and served that purpose very well. Dr. Hence's presentation was meant to be an introduction to "Managing Change". However, respondents felt that she spent more time discussing her Perkins projects than on the topic of managing change. Overall it was a good presentation.

The final portion of the assessment included questions related to specific goals of the workshop or information regarding information dissemination (newsletter and website). The following table displays the frequency of participant answers for each category of response (no, some, yes, very much)

Responses indicate that specific goals of the workshop were met: Ninety-four per cent of the respondents reported that their beliefs regarding assessment were modified; 93% of the respondents reported that the communications regarding SACS requirements or the QEP were clear; 100% of the respondents reported that workshop information was applicable to

Were your beliefs, philosophies or expectations regarding assessment modified by your participation in this workshop?	1	6	4	4	
Was communication about assessment, SACS requirements or the QEP process clear?	0	1	8	6	
Was the information applicable to your campus/program?	0	0	10	5	
Were you given opportunities to discuss your needs regarding assessment or the QEP?	0	0	10	5	
Did you receive a TASL newsletter?	8	na	7	na	
Have you visited the TASL website?	7	na	8	na	
Were the topics presented or discussed relevant to your needs?	0	2	7	6	

their own campuses; 100% reported that there were opportunities to

interact with others; and 100% reported that the workshop topics were relevant to their needs at varying degrees. Responses to the newsletter and website items will be noted and attempt at more widespread distribution will be made in the near future.

Finally, anecdotal remarks were very positive and encouraging.

- "Dr. Pate did an excellent job in facilitating the workshop in productive, but friendly, relaxed way."
- "The SACS Compliance and QEP 101 presentation was excellent."
- "Specific examples always welcome."
- "Exemplary workshop!"
- "Exceeded my expectations very much, very helpful, thank you!"
- "Definitely" will use workshop information on my campus.
- "I liked the informal."
- "I think my administrators would be better suited in attending." "A lot of information that I probably have never learned."
- "All presenters were excellent."
- "Wonderful communication and sharing of assessment information. I really enjoyed sharing ideas and valid information."